Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/812,240	BALINGIT, RONALD F.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ardith E. Hertzog	1754
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Under Final Rejection</u>	
(1) Ronald F. Balingit.	(3)	
(2) <u>Ardith E. Hertzog</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 August 2005	Time: approx. 3:15 pm, ED	<u>) T</u>
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: N/A		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
•		
Inditte & Aestaco	N/A	
(Applicant)	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: As a courtesy to applicant in this pro se application, a call was placed to remind him that the statutory period for reply from the Final Rejection, mailed 2/4/2005, expires 8/4/2005. In order to avoid abandonment of the application, a Notice of Appeal, with appropriate petition for extension of time (3-months, since the shortened statutory period for reply ended 5/5/2005), would need to be filed on or before 8/4/2005. Applicant's attention was directed to page 1200-5 of the MPEP for the proper Notice of Appeal format, as well as the USPTO website, www.uspto.gov, which provides access to an electronic copy of the MPEP.